

**OPINION 2346 (Case 3588)*****Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 (Insecta, Diptera, BRACHYSTOMATIDAE):  
usage conserved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has conserved under the plenary power the current usage of the generic name *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 for a well-established genus of brachystomatid flies by setting aside all type fixations for *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 prior to that of *Syrphus vesiculosus* Fabricius, 1794 by Blanchard (1840).

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Diptera; BRACHYSTOMATIDAE; *Brachystoma*; *Trichopeza*; *Syrphus vesiculosus*; *Brachystoma vesiculosum*; brachystomatid flies; worldwide.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power, all type species fixations for the nominal genus *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 before that of *Syrphus vesiculosus* Fabricius, 1794 by Blanchard (1840) are hereby set aside.
- (2) The name *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 (gender: neuter), type species *Syrphus vesiculosus* Fabricius, 1794 by subsequent designation of Blanchard (1840), as ruled in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The name *vesiculosus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Syrphus vesiculosus* (specific name of the type species of *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822); is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) The name BRACHYSTOMATIDAE Melander, 1908 (type genus *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3588**

An application to conserve the usage of the generic name *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 for a well-established genus of brachystomatid flies by setting aside all type fixations for *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822 prior to that of *Syrphus vesiculosus* Fabricius, 1794 by Blanchard (1840) was received from Neal L. Evenhuis (*J. Linsley Gressitt Center for Entomological Research, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.*) and Bradley J. Sinclair (*Canadian National Collection of Insects & Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Ottawa Plant Laboratory-Entomology, Ottawa, ON, Canada*) on 11 April 2012. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 69: 113–115 (June 2012). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. The Case was sent for vote on 1 March 2014. A majority of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (21 For, 4 Against). No comments were received on this Case.

**Decision of the Commission**

At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2014 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 21: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Halliday, Harvey, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – 4: Fautin, Grygier, Kojima and Lim.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

Voting FOR, Alonso-Zarazaga requested that the gender of *Brachystoma* should be indicated as neuter in the final ruling, as this is one of the examples included in Article 30.1.2 of the Code. Also voting FOR, Rosenberg said that another consideration not mentioned in the application was that *Trichopeza* is the type genus of TRICHOPEZINAE. Without action by the Commission, BRACHYSTOMATINAE would become the correct name for TRICHOPEZINAE (currently placed in BRACHYSTOMATIDAE). Also voting FOR, Yanega explained that despite the relatively small number of taxa involved in this application, and their relative obscurity, the degree of disruption that would result if the application was rejected was significant because there was ‘collateral damage’, namely, another genus, long in use, would not only lose its name, but have it replaced by a name which had always referred to a completely different set of species. He also said that we would not have tolerated the replacement, for example, of ‘*Canis*’ by ‘*Felis*’, not simply because the taxa are widely-known, but because their usage has been consistent and stable for centuries. If it were simply a matter of a single name being replaced, he might not have supported such an application (depending on other details of the Case), but this particular Case (along with Cases 3589 and 3595) involved moving a long-established name from one taxon to an entirely different taxon, and that was disruptive enough to merit the use of the Commission’s powers regardless of how widely-known the taxa involved were.

Voting AGAINST, Grygier said that the generic assignment of fewer than a dozen species of *Brachystoma* and evidently nine species (a number not mentioned in the Case, but learned by the Commission afterwards from author Evenhuis) of *Trichopeza* is at stake. Although the authors did not mention it, the subfamily name BRACHYSTOMATINAE Melander, 1908 would move along with its type genus, putting TRICHOPEZINAE Vaillant, 1981 in jeopardy. The valid subfamily name for the former BRACHYSTOMATINAE, including *Blepharoprocta*, was not clear from the Case. The significance of any of these species or genera or subfamilies outside of taxonomy is not addressed. Under these circumstances, the discovery of an overlooked type species designation seems a minor annoyance, not justifying employment of the plenary power. Also, BRACHYSTOMATIDAE was not the subject of any substantive ruling in this Case, and is not threatened whatever the outcome; it is therefore unclear, under the specifications provided in Article 78.4.2, why it should be entered in the Official List. Also voting AGAINST, Kojima said that considering that the present proposal was more or less taxonomic rather than simply nomenclatural, the following taxonomic background should have been clearly mentioned to justify the proposal: (1) how widely the assignment of *longicornis* Meigen, 1822 to *Trichopeza* Rondani, 1856 is accepted; and (2) the reason why *Trichopeza* Rondani, 1856 should be treated as a valid genus, but not as a junior subjective synonym of *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822. Also, the proposal should have clearly mentioned the nomenclatural instability that would result from synonymizing *Trichopeza* Rondani, 1856 under *Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822.

**Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*Brachystoma* Meigen, 1822, Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zwei-flügeligen Insekten. Dritter Theil. Schultz-Wundermann, Hamm, p. 12.

*vesiculosus*, *Syrphus*, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia Systematica*, vol. 4. C.G. Proft, Hafniae, p. 299.

BRACHYSTOMATIDAE Melander, 1908, Family Empididae, in Williston, S.W. *Manual of North American Diptera*. Third Edition. J.T. Hathaway, New Haven, p. 222.

The following is the original reference for the type species designation cited in this ruling:

**Blanchard, C.E.** 1840. Vol. III. Histoire naturelle des insectes. Orthoptères, névroptères, hémiptères, hyménoptères, lépidoptères et diptères. In Laporte, F.L.N. de C., *Histoire naturelle des animaux articulés. Annelides, crustacés, arachnides, myriapodes et insectes*. Duméril, Paris. [26 December], p. 582.